

CHARLOTTE JOURNAL.

VOL. VI.]

Charlotte, (N. C.) April 22, 1836.

[NO. 290.]

R. H. MADRA, Editor.
T. J. HOLTON, Proprietor and Publisher.

TERMS:

TWO DOLLARS, if paid in advance.
Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, if not paid within
three months.
Three Dollars, if not paid until the end of the
year.
Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

Agent.—Major R. M. Cochran is appointed an
Agent for the Journal, and is authorized to receive
money and give receipts in my name. T. J. H.

WEEKLY ALMANAC.

APRIL, 1836.	Sun rises/sets.	MOON'S PHASES
Friday, 5 23 6 37		For April, 1836.
Saturday, 5 22 6 38		D. H. M.
Sunday, 5 21 6 39		Full 1 4 52 aft'n.
Monday, 5 20 6 40		Last 8 11 13 fore'n.
Tuesday, 5 19 6 41		New 15 5 17 aft'n.
Wednesday, 5 18 6 42		First 23 9 33 morn.
Thursday, 5 17 6 43		

Deferred Articles.

In the Session of 1832, a resolution passed the House of Representatives of the United States, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to lay before the House at each Session of Congress, as full statements of the condition of the State Banks as can be obtained. In his letter transmitting the statements for the present year, the Secretary of the Treasury says that the information obtained for the past year has been with great care and labor digested and arranged into tabular statements.

In the first place there is a separate table for each State, exhibiting the names of all the Banks in the State, the name and place of each, its loans and discounts, stocks, real estate, debts from other banks, bank notes, specie, other investments, capital, deposits, circulation and other liabilities. After going through each State separately, there are several general tables, one showing the condition of the banks, as an aggregate, in each of the principal cities of the Union, another exhibiting a summary statement of the condition of the Banks in each State and the whole United States, as near the 1st January 1835 as could be obtained.

From this last table it appears, that at that period, the whole number of banks in the United States amounted to about 558, with a capital of \$231,250,000, a circulation of \$103,600,000, loans and discounts \$85,000,000, specie \$44,000,000, real estate \$11,000,000, stocks \$9,000,000, other investments \$4,000,000.

The State which has by far the greatest number of Banks, is Massachusetts, having 105 out of the whole number of 550. These 105 have a capital of thirty millions and a half. The number in the State of New York is 87, with a capital of thirty-one millions and a half. Pennsylvania has 44, with a capital of eighteen millions. Maryland 15, with a capital of seven millions and a half. The table of the banks in the principal cities gives to Boston 26 banks, with a capital of little over seventeen millions; to New York 21, with a capital of nearly eighteen millions; to Philadelphia 16, with a capital of nearly thirteen millions; to Baltimore 7, with a capital of five millions two hundred thousand. The Boston Banks have only eight hundred and eighty thousand dollars in specie, while those of New York, with almost the same capital, have nearly six millions of specie. Those of Philadelphia have three millions three hundred thousand in specie, and those of Baltimore six hundred thousand.

The condensed statement of the condition of all the Banks, at different intervals, in the United States, shows the immense increase of Banks and banking capital in the last twenty-five years.

In 1811, there were in the United States 90 Banks with an aggregate capital of fifty-two millions and a half, and fifteen millions of specie. In 1815, the number of Banks had increased to 208, the capital to eighty-two millions, and specie to seven millions. In 1820, the number of banks was 208, capital one hundred and thirty millions, and specie twenty. In 1830, the number of banks 320, capital one hundred and forty-five millions, specie twenty-two. And in 1835, the number was 558, capital two hundred and thirty-one millions, specie forty-four.—Baltimore American.

Remarkable incident.—A lunatic from Allemarie, (whose name we have not heard) under an escort to the Williamsburg Hospital, was lodged on Friday night at the Bell Tavern in this City. Eluding, by some means, the vigilance of his guard at about 9 o'clock of that evening, he leaped out of the three-story window upon the cellar door in front, and was thrown forward into the street gutter. To the surprise of every one, he was taken up uninjured—there being no sign of break or bruise on his person.

How truly inscrutable are the ways of Providence! The noble structure of reason and fortitude, yet the frail habilitment of mortality preserved unharmed during a perilous and appalling leap, from which destruction seemed inevitable.—Rich. Comp.

The number of deaths in the City and Liberties of Philadelphia, in 1835, was 5666, of which 384 were children.

"EXPUNGING"—THE "EXPUNGING" COMMISSIONER.

The Globe announces the arrival of Mr. Rives at Washington, the Special Commissioner from old Virginia, to "expunge" the records obtained by the Constitution! Glorious distinction! Worthy duty! Epaminondas himself could not make it other than infamous! Benton's troops are now in array! To work, noble Senators, so worthy of that august name! Draw your black lines around! Blar and defile the records of the country, of constitutional sanction! Do it for no public good—for no commandment of truth—for no requisition of patriotism—but do it, to please one man, even the man who hath the loaves and fishes—Gen. Jackson! Have we taken an erroneous view of this matter, when the very idea of Senators of the U. S., representing the sovereignty of the sovereign States of this Union, engaged in the wretched, the most contemptible process of "drawing black lines around" an entry on a record, fills us with impatient abomination? Can we be mistaken in the prediction, that the "Expungers" who ordered, and the tools that may execute this foul and damnable disgrace, will be whelmed by a mountain load of obloquy?

We are not mistaken. We but do reason and justice to the good sense, the justice, the patriotism, the magnanimity of our countrymen. They cannot approve the foolish and slavish act.—Richmond Whig.

The consistent Party.—The friends of Mr. Van Buren express great horror at the idea of the election of President devolving upon the House of Representatives. If they are sincere in deprecating the election by the House, they take a strange way of showing it. At the last session of Congress, Mr. Gilmer, of Georgia, introduced a Resolution, the object of which was to amend the Constitution, as to place the election of President directly in the hands of the People. Who was it that prevented the passage of the Resolution? THE VAN BUREN MEN? This is the fact and cannot be denied. This very party which pretends to be so uneasy at the thought of the election going into the House of Representatives, voted against a Resolution intended to prevent such a contingency. The Journals of Congress will show it. A large majority of the Representation in Congress from New-York, New-Hampshire, and Maine, States which have always been claimed for Mr. Van Buren, and where the Caucus system flourishes in full vigor, voted against Mr. Gilmer's proposition. And yet Mr. Van Buren's friends accuse the supporters of Judge White of a studied design to carry the election to the House, and pretend to be excessively alarmed at the probability of its going there. What motive can the friends of Judge White have in wishing the House to decide the question? Would a plain Republican, like Hugh L. White, stand any chance there, against Martin Van Buren, the Prince of intrigues? None in the world, and his friends, knowing this, seriously deprecate a resort to that mode of settling the matter.—Raleigh Register.

Stage Accident.—Drunken Driver.—A few nights ago, as the Editor of this paper, with three other passengers, were travelling in the mail coach from Camden to Cheraw, the driver in a state of intoxication fell from the box. Before this was discovered by any of us in the stage, the horses set off at full speed, for a short distance, when one of the wheels, striking a tree, turned over the stage. Such was the violence of the shock, that the harness of the lead horses and the tongue of the carriage were broken, which prevented the stage being dragged further, and saved the passengers from any severe injury.

Two of the passengers who went back a distance of more than two miles to the last house which we had passed, for the purpose of procuring light, found the driver two or three hundred yards from the place where the accident occurred, lying as he had fallen, in the mud. They roused him, and finding that he was not hurt, and that he could render them no assistance, they left him till their return, when they brought him along, staggering drunk, in a cart which they had procured to transport the baggage to a place of security and a shelter from the rain, which was falling upon us without intermission.

If contractors for carrying the mail by stage were subjected to heavy penalties, every time any driver in their employ was found intoxicated, whether an accident occurred or not, they would be more careful to employ only "temperance" men as drivers; and the lives of passengers would not be so often endangered.

We, on the morning of the same day found a newspaper bag lying on the road, which seemed to have dropped from the stage the night before.

The enterprising and efficient contractor who owns this line will, we hope, take steps to prevent the recurrence of such accidents.—Cheraw Gazette.

The brig Ark, arrived at the port of New York from London, having on board 1,788 bags of wheat, 600 bags of oats, and 2,750 barrels of FLOUR!

SPEECH OF JUDGE WHITE, ON THE Abolition Petitions.

Delivered in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President: I address you under the solemn conviction that if this Government is to continue to accomplish the great purposes for which it was established, it can only be by administering it in the same spirit in which it was created.

When the Constitution was framed, the great and leading interests of the whole country were considered, and, in the spirit of liberality and compromise, were adjusted and settled. They were settled upon principles that ought to remain undisturbed so long as the Constitution lasts, which I hope will be forever; for although liberty may be preferable to the Union, yet I think the Union is indispensable to liberty. At the formation of the Constitution, slavery existed in many of the States; it was one of the prominent interests that was then settled; it, in all its domestic bearings, was left exclusively to the States, to do with it as they might think best, without any interference on the part of the Federal Government. This, it is admitted by every gentleman who has addressed you, is now the case in every slaveholding State; therefore, it is only urged that Congress has the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. It should never be forgotten that, when the Constitution was formed and adopted, what is now the District of Columbia was then comprehended within two of the slaveholding States, Maryland and Virginia.

Suppose, when all the details of the Constitution had been adjusted, it had been foreseen that the District of Columbia would be formed out of a tract of country ceded by those States, and situated in the centre between them, it had been asked of the members of the Convention, What do you intend as to the District? You have placed the question of slavery in the States entirely under their control within their respective limits—do you intend that Congress shall have the power to abolish slavery in the District? Would not every man have answered in the negative?

It has been said that when petitions to abolish slavery are presented to either House of Congress, those who demand the question whether they shall be received, and thus produce discussion, are agitators, and produce excitement on this delicate subject. To me it seems this is unfair. Let us for a moment consider the circumstances of the country, and the situation in which we are all placed.

There are twenty-four States, several Territories and the District. Thirteen of these States have no slaves, the other eleven have slaves; in fact, their slaves constitute a large item of all the property they own. During the past year, it has so happened that many newspapers, pamphlets, and petitional representations made their appearance, and were, through the mail, and by other means, extensively circulated in the slaveholding States. By these means, a spirit of discontent was created, which occasioned much excitement and disorder in various places, and rendered it necessary, in a summary manner, to put to death several white persons, and a number of slaves. In various quarters of the Union there were assemblages of people, who expressed their opinions with great freedom. In the course of the fall and winter, many of the State Legislatures have been in session; they have been addressed on this subject by their respective Governors. They have expressed publicly their opinions; the President, in his message, has invited the attention of Congress to it; the Senate has referred that part of the message to a special committee, which has made a lengthy report, accompanied by a bill, which is now upon our docket, and must, in due course, be discussed, and either passed or rejected. Are all these to be called agitators, and charged with unnecessarily producing excitement? If not, how is it that members of Congress are to be thus charged when petitions are presented that we must in some mode dispose of? Each of us must suggest such mode as we think most correct, and none can justly be liable to any such charge. If there is any wrong, it is found in those who, in such a state of public feeling, will press their petitions upon us. The petitions are forwarded to members who feel it their duty to present them; when presented, others think it their duty to demand the question whether they shall be received. Is it true that on this delicate subject every officer of the Federal or State Government can express his opinion as to what is best to do, and that a Senator dare not express his opinion without being liable to censure? I hope not.

This is a delicate subject: would to God it had not been pressed upon us; but as it is placed here by the petitioners, we must dispose of it. To enable us to do so, we must think upon it, and we may tell each other what we think, and our reasons for so thinking. It is not by speaking upon it we will be likely to do mischief. Everything depends upon the temper with which we express our opinions, and the sentiments we advance. My wish and aim is, if I can do no good, to do no harm; and if I believed in what I propose to say, I would utter a sentiment from which mischief would be produced, I would close my lips, take my seat, and content myself with yes or nay to every question proposed by others, leaving every person at liberty to conjecture the reasons for my votes; but entertaining no fear of that kind, I must ask permission to state, as briefly as I can, some of the reasons for the course I shall pursue. In doing this, I shall not address myself to Senators coming from either the East or the West, the North or the South, in particular, but to the Senate, the whole Senate, because, if it is desired, as I believe it is, that we should remain together as one people, secure, prosperous, happy and contented, the whole country, every section of it, having a deep interest in this matter, this agitation and excitement must cease.

What then ought we to do, as most likely to put an end to those angry feelings which now prevail?

In my opinion we should refuse to receive these petitions. It is a mere question of expediency what disposition we shall make of them. All who have yet spoken admit that Congress has no power whatever over slavery in the respective States. It is settled. Whether slavery is right or wrong, we have no power to consider or discuss. Suppose, then, a petition were presented, to abolish slavery in the States, would we receive it?—Assuredly we ought not, because it would be asking us to act upon a subject over which we have no power.

But these are petitions asking Congress to abolish slavery in this District. Have we the power? I think not. I consider the argument of the honorable Senator from Virginia, (Mr. Leigh,) upon that point, conclusive. It has not been answered, and I do not believe it can be. Slaves are property in this District—Congress cannot take private property, even for public use, without making just

compensation to the owner. No fund is provided by the Constitution to pay for slaves which may be liberated, and the Constitution never gives Congress the power to act upon any subject, without, at the same time, furnishing the means for its accomplishment. To liberate slaves is not a taking for public use. It is declaring that neither individuals nor the public shall use them. I will not weaken the honorable member's argument by going over it.

This District was intended as the place where the great business of the nation should be transacted for the good of the whole. Congress, under the Constitution, is placed here to legislate upon those subjects enumerated and specified in the Constitution, that we might be able to protect ourselves, and the officers residing here, and be out of the reach of the laws of any State. It was never intended that we should have any local legislation, except such as would meet the wants and wishes of the People residing within the ten mile square. We should never permit this place to be converted into a political workshop, where plans would be devised, or carried into operation, that will have the effect of destroying the interest of any of the States.

Members of Congress, executive and judicial officers, were to come from any and every section of the Union, from the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding States, and their property was to be as secure here, in this ten miles square, as it was in the States from which they respectively came. They would bring their habits and their domestic servants with them; those from the non-slaveholding States their hired servants, and those from the slaveholding States their slaves. And who can believe it was intended to vest the power in Congress to liberate them if brought within the District?

Again: the right of property in slaves in the States is sacred and beyond the power of Congress to interfere with, in any respect; yet if it be conceded that we have the power to liberate them in the District, we can as effectually ruin the owners as if we had the power to liberate slaves in the States. By abolishing slavery here, we not only make a place of refuge for runaways, but we produce a spirit of discontent and rebellion in the minds of slaves in the neighboring States, which will soon spread over all, and which cannot fail to compel owners to destroy their own slaves, to preserve their own lives and those of their wives and children. I beseech gentlemen to look at this matter as it is. Take for illustration the case of a small planter in Mississippi, living on his own land, with thirty slaves to cultivate it. Suddenly it is discovered that one-half of them are concerned in a plot to destroy the lives of their master, his family, and neighbors, with a view to produce their freedom, and immediately, with or without law, they are tucked up and hanged. The man is thus deprived of his property without any chance for an indemnity, besides the disgust and anxiety of mind occasioned by loss of confidence in his remaining slaves. It cannot have been intended that Congress, by acting on this subject, should have a power thus to occasion a destruction of slave property.

To me it seems that we ought to treat these petitions precisely as we would do if they prayed us to abolish slavery in one of the States. We have no more power to abolish it here than we have there. I think, in either case, we ought to refuse to receive them. I hold, that if the petitioners ask us to do that which we have no power to do, or to do that which will be productive of a great and lasting mischief, we not only have the right, but that it is our duty to refuse to receive them.

By the Constitution, no man can be held to answer for a criminal charge but by presentment or indictment. Suppose a petition presented here, alleging that some citizen in the District had been guilty of a crime, and that he was so influential that he could not be reached by the ordinary forms of law in court, and therefore we are asked to pass a bill of attainder: ought we to receive the petition? Suppose a petition to ask us to pass a law to prohibit any member of this body from making a speech against the prayer of the petitioners, would we receive it? Suppose a petition to be offered asking us to establish a particular religion in this District, or to prohibit any publication in a newspaper on the subject of abolishing slavery, unless it was previously approved of by a committee: would we, ought we, to receive any such petition? I think most certainly, we ought not. But suppose we have the power, is there any Senator who believes we ought to exercise it? I trust not. Those who urge the reception of this petition, which is from the Society of Friends, have spoken most highly of the petitioners and the class of citizens to which they belong. In all this I cheerfully concur. These particular persons are strangers to me. I doubt not the purity of their motives; the sect to which they belong is worthy of all the encomiums passed upon it. I respect and esteem them most highly, and do not feel that in my composition there is a particle of unkindness towards them; but I think they would have us do that which we have no power to do, and if we had the power, by exercising it, we should do infinite mischief. This these petitioners do not desire. They have discharged what they think is their duty by having their petitions presented; I only discharge mine, when I say, consistently with what I feel to be my duty, I cannot receive them.

But it is further insisted that the right of petition is a sacred one, that it belongs to the nature of free government, and existed before the formation of our Constitution, and that instrument did not give the right to petition, but intended only to secure it. This is sound doctrine, and has my hearty assent. The People are sovereign; members are their agents or servants; they have a right to make known their grievances, real or imaginary. We can pass no law, we can make no rule to abridge or destroy that right. But what do gentlemen mean when they speak of the right of petition? Do they mean that, when the petition is presented we must receive it, and do that which is prayed for? No. Not one member contended for this; so far from it, they say, that if the language of the petitioner is disrespectful to the body, or to any member of it, we may and ought to refuse to receive it.

How is this? I beg that we may reflect seriously upon this matter. We are about to establish a doctrine to which I can never yield my assent. Are we to be exalted above our employers? Is our dignity to be of higher consideration than the property and lives of those who send us here? If a petition contains matter charging disgraceful conduct on the Senate, or any of its members, we may not receive it; but if it contains matter which is to destroy the slave property in this District, and in eleven States of this Union, and also to endanger the lives and dwelling of every citizen within their limits, we are bound to receive it. This is the doctrine contained in the arguments. I deny that there is any such distinction to be found in a single feature of our political institutions.—

The truth is, we have the power in both instances to refuse to receive the petitions, but in exercising it, when we ourselves only are assailed, we ought always to act most liberally in receiving; but where the safety, the lives and the property of our masters are concerned, we have no right to exercise the same liberality.

With great deference for the opinions of others, I think the force of their whole argument rests on a plain mistake. They argue as if we never became acquainted with the contents of a petition, or could consider and decide upon its merits until after it is received. This is most clearly not correct. What we have been doing for the last few weeks is full proof of it. These petitions have been publicly read, their merits and tendency, and our powers to abolish slavery have been long under discussion; has any man denied our right to do so? Not one; the only doubt suggested is, whether it was prudent to adopt this course.

By the 24th Rule, when a petition is presented, the member must briefly state its contents, and what the petitioners wish should be done. He then asks that the petition may be received, and specifies what he wishes to be done with it after it is received. If no member objects, for the purpose of saving time, it is received and disposed of without formally propounding the question of reception; but if any member objects, he may call for the reading, and then urge his reasons why it should not be received. This Rule establishes no new doctrine; it is founded in good sense, is perfectly consistent with the right of petition, and is laid down as the correct practice by Mr. Jefferson in his Manual at page 140. What is the right of the petitioner? It consists in his having free permission to make known to Congress what he esteems a grievance, and to ask them to provide a remedy. When this petition is presented, the duty of Congress commences. That consists in the members making themselves acquainted with the contents of the petition, and granting its prayer, if it be just and consistent with the public interests, or in refusing to receive the petition, or making some other disposition of it, which, in their judgment, is more conducive to the good of the community. When we refuse to receive a petition, we no more destroy or impair the right of petition, than we do when we receive the petition and lay it upon the table, or reject the prayer of it, or refer it to a committee, who reports that it is unreasonable, and ought not to be granted. In each of these cases, the complaint of the petitioner, has been heard, considered and decided on. In neither instance has he obtained a redress for what he supposed a grievance, but each leaves him equally at liberty to renew his petition at any subsequent period.

Four modes have been suggested by which to dispose of this and all others on the same subject. The first we have been considering, and is to refuse to receive it.

The second is to receive them, lay them on the table, and there let them lie.

The third is to receive them, and then instantly reject the prayer of the petitioners.

The fourth is to receive them, refer them to a committee, and let that committee make a report upon them.

I prefer the first, because, when we refuse to receive the petitions, they are returned to those who sent them, and it will most strongly discomfite all hope that Congress ever can, or ever ought, to pass any law upon the subject to which they refer. In each of the other three, we retain the petitions, place them on our files, in the custody of our officer, and at any subsequent session they are here, and it will be competent for any member to move their reference to a committee; whereas, if returned to the petitioners, if they ever again make their appearance, it must be by their being re-sent and re-presented. I think that plan is the most advisable, and will be most likely to calm the disturbance in the slave States, which will most strongly manifest to all, in every quarter, that Congress will not interfere with slavery as it exists in the States and in this District.

If these petitions are received, I then think the disposition of them proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania the next best—that is, immediately to reject their prayer. This would be far preferable to laying them silently on the table, without expressing any opinion whatever.

There is another aspect in which this question may be viewed, that has had great influence on my own mind. Congress sits here as the Legislature of the whole Union, and also as the only Legislature for the District of Columbia. These petitions do not ask us to make a general law, operating throughout the whole Union, but a law, the operations of which are to be spent entirely upon property within the ten miles square. Now, if we were in form, as well as in substance, a local Legislature when acting on this question, which gentlemen say is to affect slavery in the District, and nowhere else, would we be bound to receive petitions from France or Germany. Would gentlemen, if sitting as members of the Legislature of Alabama, feel bound to receive petitions from citizens of Maine or Pennsylvania to emancipate slaves within their own State? Assuredly not. If that be so, is it not most reasonable, when we are called upon to pass an act confined exclusively to this District, that we would conduct towards the people here as if in this matter they were our constituents? Will it not be time enough to receive petitions on this subject when they are presented on behalf of those upon whose property alone it is said the law would operate?

Honorable Senators have told us there are two classes of abolitionists, and that public opinion will soon put down the mischievous class, which is small in numbers. Gentlemen, I doubt not, think as they say. All we know is, that our peace has been very much disturbed by them, whether few or many. Their newspapers, their pamphlets, and pictorial representations have been plenty. They have come to us through the mail, and by other means, in great abundance; and, if we are to live together as one people, they must stop. It is vain to reason with people about the liberty of speech and of the press, when their lives are put at hazard. When the domestic circle is invaded, when a man is afraid to eat his provisions, lest his cook has been prevailed on to mix poison with his food, or dare not go to sleep, lest the servants will cut the throats of himself, his wife, and children before he wakes, he will not endure it; and, when he can lay hands upon those who prompt to such deeds of mischief, he will not wait for the ordinary forms of law to redress him. He takes the law into his own hands, and every thing which accustoms us to violate the law is a serious evil in a country as free as ours, where the laws should govern.

The honorable Senator from Mississippi has shown us something of the feelings of his State, which has suffered much. In Tennessee when we first heard of punishing persons in Mississippi, without legal trial, we thought it all wrong, and some of our leading newspapers courteously found